

## **Stormwater Advisory Board**

### **Meeting Minutes**

March 28, 2014

I. Welcome and Call to Order the regular meeting of the Stormwater Advisory Board was called to order at 3:03 pm on March 28, 2014 in The W.A.T.E.R. Center by Chris Bohm (Chair).

#### **Present**

##### **Board Members**

Greg Allison  
Richard Basore  
Chris Bohm  
Hoyt Hillman  
Don Kirkland  
David Leyh  
Gary Oborny  
Joe Pajor  
Jim Weber

#### **Absent**

##### **Board Members**

Mitch Mitchell

##### **City of Wichita Staff**

Mark Hall  
Jim Hardesty  
Scott Lindebak  
Don Henry

##### **City of Wichita Staff**

Dale Goter (CMO)

#### **Visitors**

Trisha Moore  
Ron Graber  
Daniel Schrant  
Brian Glenn  
Alan King

## **II. Approval of Minutes**

Bohm asked the committee to look over the minutes from January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2013. He said that he would entertain a motion to approve the minutes. Hillman motioned and Pajor seconded.

## **III. Review Offsite BMP Program & RFP**

Bohm started meeting off by saying that since Oborny was not in attendance at the moment that the review of the developer survey was going to be parked and he was going to move right into the program and the RFP. Bohm introduced the board to Alan King, the City of Wichita's Director of Public Works & Utilities. Bohm said that he wanted to bring Mr. King up to date on what the board had been working on over the last few months. Bohm explained that there were some changes to the manual; they have also been looking at an Offsite BMP Program that could be utilized by the City of Wichita and outside the corporate limits of the City of Wichita. Bohm went on to say that all of those things made a culmination of the letter that was sent to Mr. King asking him to hire a consultant to help the board contrast two programs; a city run program and one utilizing a WRAPS program. He explained that the board has not talked about the funding but had kicked some ideas around but there has been no census.

Bohm said that despite the funding they think that there is some merit to this program and it would have much more bang for the buck no matter what the funding source. Bohm turned the floor over to Mr. King. Mr. King started off by saying that he was very much in support of what is being proposed in the letter, he stated that Scott Lindebak has since looked and there is available budget to move ahead with this project of the RFP. Mr. King went on to give his thoughts about what needs to be included in the study. He said that he is not wed to one program or the other but he wanted to make sure that the scope looks at potential impacts on regulatory compliance if there is no city control. He wants the last bullet on the letter expanded, how is it initialed funded, maintained and what is the permanency and cash flow. Mr. King went on to explain some of this thoughts about the funding questions he has. He said that he wants to see cash flow, cap X, cap and operating costs, permanency along with regulatory liability for the city if someone were to do it outside the city, and he wants those expressly laid out as questions that we want answers to in this study. Mr. King went on to say that with the board's endorsement he would like to direct Scott to proceed with that kind of scope and he wanted to share it with the board and see what everyone thought. Discussion ensued about costs and whose responsibility it should be. Bohm asked if there were any other questions or comments for the RFP, there were a few other discussions about things that the board felt also needed to be looked at in the RFP. Bohm then asked Rob Graber how the funds worked with WRAPS and the projects that they work on throughout the year. Graber went on to explain how the funds are transferred to the farmers after the projects are started. Bohm asked if there were any other issues about the RFP that we need to discuss. Mr. King asked that once the RFP is complete that it be sent to him so that he can review and approve it. Bohm said that he would entertain a motion that the information that was provided today be forwarded formally to Mr. King and ask him to have Stormwater do the RFP. Weber said that he would make that motion but that it be added that once the RFP is complete that it be sent back to the board for review. Hillman and the board seconded. Bohm thanked Mr. King for attending.

#### **IV. Streambank Assessment**

Graber started his discussion by saying that a few months ago Hillman asked him to come in and elaborate a little more about the streambank assessment work that WRAPS has done on the Little Ark and that is what his presentation is about. See PDF for maps. Graber went into his presentation and showed examples of the work that has been done. He went on to say that the method that they used was by using aerial photography and comparing them (sites) over time. There were 52 sites that they felt needed attention, they only chose eight sites. What was needed was a rough estimate of sediment contribution from the sites and they went and visited them. They measured the bank height and used the soil density figure multiplied that out, divided it out by how many years, that is a quick and dirty explanation of it. Graber asked if there were any questions of him about what he just went over. Hillman asked if there was a certain tree that works better than another and Graber replied that it is very much a site by site thing on what might work. There was discussion between board members and Graber about how to come up with the sediment loads and easements on the sites. Bohm stated that he sees that this is promising with a WRAPS program. Bohm thanked Graber for his presentation.

#### **V. Ron Graber & Trisha Moore Pre Proposal**

As Graber's presentation was wrapping up Hillman stated that Graber & Trisha Moore wanted to talk about a special grant that they are working on. NRCS awards a Conservation Innovation Grant and there was discussion about submitting one for a study in this area comparing Urban Controls vs. Rural Controls and Trisha volunteered to be the lead to write the pre proposal. Trisha Moore followed up by saying that they will find out in about a week or so if they will be invited to submit a full proposal. They would get funding to out some of the practices in the Ag area do some monitoring and modeling. She advised that she will keep the board in the loop on what happens. Graber said that if they get thumbs up they

wanted to come back to the board to be a partner in the projects because they want to be able to monitor urban vs. rural. Moore stated that she thought that the grant would be around \$750,000.

#### **VI. Review of Survey Status**

Bohm went back to Oborny saying that his item was skipped to start right in with the RFP. Oborny said that there was still information being put together and Bohm said okay that could be an item for next month's agenda. In looking at next month's meeting there was discussion that the SWAB meeting needed to be changed to April 25<sup>th</sup>.

#### **VII. Agenda for April Meeting**

Bohm set up the agenda for next month's meeting.

- Review Oborny's survey results
- Graber will update the board on the grant
- Scope of the RFP

#### **IX. Adjournment**

Bohm asked the board if there was any other business, he said that since there is none he would entertain a motion to adjourn. Kirkland motioned and Weber seconded meeting adjourned at 4:40.